

# **ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT**

## **MISSOURI PART C**



Submitted February 1, 2010

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Division of Special Education

## Table of Contents

Introduction to the Annual Performance Report: .....	3
<b>Indicator 1:</b> Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. ....	5
<b>Indicator 2:</b> Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. ....	9
<b>Indicator 3:</b> Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:.....	11
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);	
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and	
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	
<b>Indicator 4:</b> Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: .....	12
A. Know their rights;	
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and	
C. Help their children develop and learn.	
<b>Indicator 5:</b> Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. ....	16
<b>Indicator 6:</b> Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. ....	18
<b>Indicator 7:</b> Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.....	19
<b>Indicator 8:</b> Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: .....	22
A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	
B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and	
C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	
<b>Indicator 9:</b> General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. ....	27
<b>Indicator 10:</b> Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.....	33
<b>Indicator 11:</b> Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.....	34
<b>Indicator 12:</b> Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted)....	35
<b>Indicator 13:</b> Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.....	36
<b>Indicator 14:</b> State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. ....	37

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09****Introduction to the Annual Performance Report:**

This Annual Performance Report (APR) covers federal fiscal year 2008 which is the state fiscal year 2009 (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009). The time period covered by this report is referred to as “2008-2009” to eliminate confusion due to the differing state and federal fiscal year terminology.

Missouri’s early intervention program, First Steps, is operated through contractual agreements in ten (10) regions across the state and a contracted Central Finance Office (CFO). The ten regional offices are known as System Points of Entry (SPOE) and they provide service coordination, evaluation and eligibility determination, as well as all local administrative activities for the program. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) is the lead state agency for the program.

The state contracts with a single entity in each region to fulfill the SPOE function. Independent providers enroll with the CFO and provide direct services to children and families as directed by Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSP). In previous years, the Department of Mental Health provided some service coordination for the First Steps program; however, after September 30, 2008, the SPOE contractors provide service coordination for all First Steps families.

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This APR was developed with review and input from the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the regional early intervention programs, as was the State Performance Plan (SPP). On December 22, 2009, the SPOE contractors and the SICC received a draft of the SPP/APR documents. These groups were asked to provide feedback to the Department so that recommendations could be considered and incorporated into the final document prior to the scheduled review of the final draft at the January 8, 2010 SICC meeting. At this meeting the SICC approved the report and accepted it as their annual report. The SICC Certification of the APR is available at <http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage/html>.

**Public Dissemination and Reporting:** Missouri’s SPP and APR are available for public viewing on the DESE website at <http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>. This webpage also provides a link to the public reporting by SPOE. These forms of reporting allow the public to review the state’s SPP targets and be aware of any progress/slippage at the state and local levels.

In addition to the annual reporting of the APR, DESE reports annually to the regional SPOE offices and the SICC on progress/slippage made across the state during the previous year on meeting the state’s targets as addressed in the State Performance Plan (SPP). During these discussions indicators are examined and evaluated related to the improvement activities described in the SPP. Data are tracked and reviewed periodically during the year to identify current trends that may require immediate technical assistance to individual regions within the state. The SICC certifies this APR report as their annual report to the Governor and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education.

**Monitoring Procedures:** The Missouri First Steps Program was restructured in 2005-06 when twenty-four (24) SPOE regions were consolidated to ten (10). The newly formed SPOEs began operation in February 2006. No initial onsite monitoring was conducted during 2006-07 because the new SPOEs were required to correct all previously identified noncompliance from the SPOE regions they inherited as a result of the restructure.

The Department did, however, review 2006-07 timeline data (Part C SPP Indicators 1, 7, and 8C) in December 2007 for all ten (10) SPOEs and twelve (12) Department of Mental Health (DMH) Regional Centers. At that time DESE planned to conduct timeline reviews for all SPOEs and DMH Regional Centers annually. In addition to the 2006-07 timeline review, results for 8A and 8B were gathered by reviewing fifteen (15) randomly selected files of children who exited the program during 2006-07 from each of five (5) SPOEs and six (6) DMH Regional Centers that would not be receiving an onsite visit in 2007-08.

Final reports for the 2006-07 review were not issued until mid-February 2008. Because reports to the agencies went out after February 1, 2008, and the agencies had not yet had twelve (12) months to correct identified noncompliance before the January 30, 2009 APR was submitted to OSEP, DESE could not report on the correction of 2006-07 noncompliance in last year's APR.

Beginning in 2007-08 the ten (10) SPOEs were divided into two sets of five (5) for monitoring purposes. Each set of five (5) SPOEs is representative of the state as a whole, since urban and rural areas are included in each cohort and the child count is similar.

In the summer of 2008, DESE decided to discontinue monitoring timelines annually for each SPOE. Beginning with 2008-09 monitoring, each set of SPOEs will include an onsite and timeline review using data from the previous year.

SPOEs are monitored for SPP compliance indicators as well as additional state standards and indicators, and any noncompliance identified must be corrected at 100% within twelve (12) months of notification. Any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct any noncompliance within twelve (12) months of the initial review (timely correction) would not be considered to be in compliance and would be subject to the enforcement actions discussed in the SPP. In conducting follow-up verification reviews for correction of identified pervasive noncompliance, the new files submitted for review must show 100% correction. If they do not, additional slices of data (additional file samples) are required until the agency is cleared of noncompliance at 100%. All correctable noncompliance identified for individual children during follow-up review(s) is required to be corrected at 100%.

**Important Note of Clarification:** As a one-time occurrence, this APR will show the correction of noncompliance for two years: 2006-07 timelines reviewed for all ten (10) SPOEs and twelve (12) DMH Regional Centers, and 2007-08 onsite monitoring of five (5) SPOEs and six (6) DMH Regional Centers. The SPOES monitored onsite in 2007-08 did not receive a timeline review, as they were still correcting any noncompliance identified during the 2006-07 timeline review.

**Evaluation of SPP Improvement Activities:** The Division of Special Education began work with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) in November of 2007 to develop a plan for evaluating the implementation and impact of all SPP Improvement Activities. The NCRRC trained Division staff in a model for evaluating improvement activities. Using this model, division staff has worked to review and revise some existing improvement activities, align those activities with relevant contractual activities, and develop action plans with implementation and impact measures for those activities. Revisions to the improvement activities are reflected in this APR. The detailed action plans and evaluation measures may be found at the following website:  
<http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>

**Regional Technical Assistance:** DESE employs five Area Directors to work as a program unit within the field. Each Area Director provides direction, training and problem solving for two contiguous SPOE regions. They also function as the statewide technical assistance resource for the program which enables the lead agency to provide a consistent message to the early intervention community. The Area Directors are supervised by the coordinator of the First Steps Program, who is employed by DESE. The Area Directors are an integral part of the movement toward Early Intervention Teams, Missouri's service delivery model that involves transdisciplinary teams and a primary provider model. Approximately 20 teams implemented this practice in 2008-09 with additional teams in the development stage. The Area Directors provide initial guidance and instruction to regional SPOE offices and providers and will provide continued mentoring to teams as Missouri achieves statewide implementation.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Indicator 1:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

At 90.4%, Missouri did not meet the 100% target for this indicator, but did show progress from the previous year.

**Children Receiving Timely IFSP Services (includes data for initial services from the entire fiscal year)**

	2006-07	2007-08**	2008-09**
Children Receiving All IFSP Services within 30 Days	N/A	1,383	1,321
Children Receiving All IFSP Services with Acceptable Reasons for Delay in Initiation of Services*	N/A	266	424
Total Children Receiving All IFSP Services within 30 Days or with Acceptable Reasons	2,416	1,649	1,745
Total Children Receiving IFSP Services*	2,964	1,834	1,931
% of Children Receiving All IFSP Services within 30 Days*	81.5%	89.9%	<b>90.4%</b>

\* Both the children receiving all services within 30 days (numerator) and the total children receiving IFSP services (denominator) include children whose delays in initiation of services were due to exceptional family circumstances. See explanation below for more information.

\*\* Data reported for 2007-08 and 2008-09 above are for five of the ten SPOEs in the state.

“Children Receiving All IFSP Services within 30 Days” is determined by comparing the first date of service for each service type to the date of parental consent for the service. The date of parental consent is assumed to be equivalent to the IFSP meeting date. If one or more services on the child's IFSP were started more than 30 days after the meeting date without an acceptable reason or if the child received a 'No Provider Available' (NPA) authorization for a service that was not then provided within the 30 days, the child is not counted as receiving all IFSP services within 30 days.

The web system prompts Service Coordinators to enter reasons when a child's first service was initiated more than 30 days after the date of parental consent (“first service” refers to the initial authorization of any early intervention service). The reasons include: 1) Parent/Child Delay; 2) Team Decision; 3) Service Coordinator Delay; 4) Provider Delay; and 5) Authorization/Billing Issue. Acceptable reasons include: Parent/Child Delay; Team Decision; and Authorization/Billing Issue. Team Decisions which indicate that the IFSP Team decided the initiation of services should not commence within the first 30 days after the team meeting are considered acceptable reasons. Authorization/Billing issues indicate that the service actually did begin within 30 days; however, an issue with the entry of an authorization or the provider's billing for the service made it appear as though the service did not start within 30 days. The table below shows the distribution of reasons which indicate that approximately 19% of delays (provider delays and Service Coordinator delays) were not acceptable. Reasons were undetermined for 7.3% of the delays.

Reasons for Untimely Service	
Authorization/Billing issue (no actual delay in provision of services)	4.1%
Parent/Child delay	52.5%
Provider delay	11.5%
Service Coordinator delay	7.5%
Team decision	17.1%
Undetermined	7.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

In Missouri's data system, a service is listed as an “authorization.” In the system, the IFSP addresses the services that will be provided to the child and family as an open authorization for the designated provider to use when billing the state system for the services provided. A “No Provider Available” (NPA) authorization means that the service listed on the IFSP does not have a provider assigned to implement the service. In some cases these authorizations are changed to a specific provider within 30 days of the IFSP development and in others the NPA authorization continues on the IFSP for a longer period of time.

DESE examined the data by region and service type to account for the children who did not receive timely services and did not have acceptable reasons for the delay. 1,931 children were included in this analysis and, excluding NPA authorizations, represented a total of 3,339 first services delivered during 2008-2009. Timely first services by SPOE ranged from approximately 87% to 90% with minimal variations across several SPOEs. The majority of the NPA authorizations are seen in regions that represent significantly rural areas of the state. The SPOE region most affected by NPA authorizations covers the southeast portion of the state. In this region, nearly all of the unacceptable initiation of services was due to provider availability issues.

An analysis by service type showed that the four most prevalent services (Speech Language Pathology, Special Instruction, Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy) were relatively close in overall timeliness with the average number of days until initial provision of services ranging from 20.90 to 24.78 days. Low-incidence services (e.g., Nutrition Services and Audiology Services) were less timely in implementation with the average number of days until initial provision of service being 26.14 and 29.62 days, respectively.

Actual delays in initiation of services ranged from one day to eight months beyond the 30-day threshold. Approximately 76% of the delays were less than 30 days beyond the 30-day threshold. The longest delay of eight months was due to two family members being hospitalized with illnesses. Other delays were due

to scheduling difficulties where either the family could not be contacted despite ongoing efforts to do so or there were significant scheduling issues between providers and families.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

While the state did not meet the target of 100% compliance, improvement over the previous year is reported.

The First Steps program recognizes the importance of timely services and takes every action possible to ensure that children and families receive the required services as soon as possible; however, if delays occur because of provider shortages or other administrative reasons not attributable to the parent or child, service coordinators discuss compensatory services and implement as directed by the IFSP team.

Improvement activities continuing for 2008-09 included the following:

- Develop and implement Transdisciplinary Service Training for Service Coordinators and providers
- Review/revise training materials for providers to address their decisions related to initiation of services after initial IFSP decisions to authorize specific services

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Transdisciplinary Service Training:** Initial statewide training on the primary provider model and team approaches to early intervention services was conducted in February and March 2007 with follow-up training in March 2008. Since these trainings, Missouri has decided to move toward a unified transdisciplinary model of service delivery. Much of FY 2009 was spent creating procedures, requirements and training plans for Missouri's team model, Early Intervention Teams (EIT). To assist the SPOEs in EIT implementation, the lead agency has developed written guidance documents defining the EIT model and a "path" to successful teaming. The First Steps Area Directors continue to support the development and training of teams across the state.

As indicated in the SPOE contracts awarded in March 2009 and implemented July 1, 2009, SPOE agencies are required to identify their individual EIT implementation plan by June 30, 2010. Following the March 2008 training DESE solicited proposals from several SPOE contractors to practice the team approach in several areas of the state. As of June 2009, there were approximately 18 "pilot" teams in place in the state. A panel presentation was provided by four providers from four different pilot teams at the April 2009 stakeholder meeting for EIT. With the assistance of National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), the stakeholders identified and discussed strengths and challenges of teaming to assist the lead agency in planning for statewide teaming.

**Review/revise training materials and technical assistance:** In July 2007, the First Steps web system was modified to collect reasons for untimely initiation of services. The reasons available for selection include 1) parent/child reason, 2) Service Coordinator reason, 3) team decision, 4) provider delay and 5) authorization/billing issue. Prior to this, there was no systematic way to determine whether delays in implementation were acceptable. The First Steps Area Directors developed written guidance on Timely Services that outlined the definitions of the five reasons and how Service Coordinators would enter reasons for untimely services. The First Steps Area Directors continue to provide technical assistance regarding the provision of services in a timely manner. Additionally, the lead agency develops Provider Newsletters to provide additional technical assistance, updates and reminders regarding service provision.

**Correction of Previous Noncompliance:** There were no findings of pervasive noncompliance issued in 2007-08, either for the 2006-07 or 2007-08 reviews of timely services.

The Department reviewed 2006-07 timely services data in December 2007 for all ten (10) SPOEs and twelve (12) Department of Mental Health (DMH) Regional Centers. Final reports for the 2006-07 timeline reviews were not issued until mid-February 2008. Because agencies had not yet had 12 months to correct identified noncompliance before last year's APR was submitted to OSEP, DESE could not report on the correction of 2006-07 noncompliance at that time.

In the summer of 2008, DESE decided to discontinue monitoring timelines annually for each SPOE. Beginning with 2008-09 monitoring, each set of 5 SPOEs will include an onsite and timeline review using data from the previous year. Therefore, the 2007-08 timeline data were reviewed for the SPOEs receiving an onsite monitoring in 2008-09.

Verification of 2007-08 individual child data indicates those who did not receive their early intervention services in a timely manner did receive the services anywhere from one day to seven months beyond the 30-day threshold. Therefore, all individual noncompliance was corrected within twelve months.

Missouri requires 100% correction of noncompliance identified in all initial monitoring reviews, as well as in any follow-up files submitted for review. Any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct any noncompliance within 12 months of the initial review (timely correction) would not be considered to be in compliance and would be subject to the enforcement actions discussed in the SPP.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

A State Performance Plan improvement activity addressing regular data reviews to evaluate Service Coordinator contacts with families in SPOEs that have delayed service provision was discontinued. The lead agency did not conduct regular data reviews for this indicator in 2008-09. It was determined that targeted technical assistance already in place, would better address improvements regarding the provision of timely services.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

**OSEP Analysis/Next Steps**

The state must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the state under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has initiated services for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

**DESE Response**

The state has described the verification of the correction on noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The state was able to verify that all noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.



## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Indicator 2:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Measurement:** Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	95.0% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Missouri exceeded the 2008-09 target for this indicator with 98.0% of children served in the home or programs for typically developing children.

Primary Setting for children under 3 years of age with active IFSPs	12/1/2006	%	12/1/2007	%	12/1/2008	%
Home	2,935	91.3%	3,173	92.0%	3,506	92.7%
Community-based Setting	198	6.2%	204	5.9%	204	5.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,133</b>	<b>97.4%</b>	<b>3,377</b>	<b>97.9%</b>	<b>3,710</b>	<b>98.0%</b>
Program Designed for Children with Developmental Delay or Disabilities	58	1.8%	53	1.5%	49	1.3%
Service Provider Location	0	0.0%	4	0.1%	9	0.2%
Hospital (Inpatient)	14	0.4%	9	0.3%	8	0.2%
Other Setting	9	0.3%	6	0.2%	5	0.1%
Residential Facility	2	0.1%	1	0.0%	3	0.1%
<b>Total Other</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>2.0%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,216</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,450</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,784</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Primary setting data in Missouri continues to show a very high percentage of children served in their natural environment. The data are supported by results of monitoring reviews which confirm that the decision-making process regarding service settings is appropriate and in compliance with regulatory requirements.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Implement regular data reviews and analyze service location data by region, demographic variables and service types in order to target specific areas, groups, services or provider agencies

- During the data review process, assign Area Directors to investigate specific agencies where there is a high level of services in a special purpose center and assist in development and implementation of improvement plans or corrective actions where necessary

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Data reviews:** Data on service settings continue to be reviewed by the Division. Providing services in the natural environment is a priority in the First Steps system, and its importance is understood by all staff working within the program. The data on location of services were reviewed throughout 2008-09 with the vast majority of services being provided in the natural environments.

**Data investigations:** While these data continue to show a very high percentage of children served in the natural environment, DESE and SPOE staff continue to review these data on an ongoing basis. Should the data indicate a need for investigation, the First Steps Area Directors would be directed to look into the situations. In order to ensure that IFSP teams are making individualized decisions regarding the settings in which infants and toddlers receive early intervention services, monitoring activities include the review of justification statements in the event that services are provided outside of the natural environment.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions to targets or improvement activities have been made in the State Performance Plan.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Indicator 3:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Measurement:** See State Performance Plan

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	See State Performance Plan

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Not Applicable for the 2008-09 APR – See the Missouri State Performance Plan at [www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html](http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html)

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Not Applicable – See the Missouri State Performance Plan at [www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html](http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html)

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

Not Applicable – See the Missouri State Performance Plan at [www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html](http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html)

MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps:

The State must provide baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.

DESE Response:

Baseline data, targets, and improvement activities are provided in the February 2010 update to the SPP.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Indicator 4:** Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	4A, 4B, 4C: 95% of parents will agree or strongly agree with the survey items

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

The state met the 2008-09 targets for indicators 4B and 4C, with family survey data indicating 95.6% and 97.4% agreement, respectively. The state did not meet the target for 4A with an agreement rate of 94.6% which is an increase over the previous year.

**Survey Instrument:** The complete parent survey can be found at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/FirstSteps/documents/2009CFOSurvey.pdf>

For the 2008 administration of the survey, surveys were sent to all families receiving First Steps services (census methodology). The response rate for 2008-09 was 26.8%. The response rate for 2007-08 was 30.2%. The survey response rate for 2006-07 was 34.2%. Survey results follow:

## Family Survey Data

- A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights

Q10. I received information and explanations about our family's rights to file a child complaint.

	Family Survey 2007	Family Survey 2008	Family Survey 2009		
Strongly Agree	91.9%	91.2%	523	52.6%	92.4%*
Agree			396	39.8%	
Disagree	8.1%	8.8%	57	5.7%	7.6%
Strongly Disagree			18	1.9%	

Q11. I received information and explanations about our family's parental rights<sup>1</sup>.

	Family Survey 2007	Family Survey 2008	Family Survey 2009		
Strongly Agree	92.8%	94.2%	573	55.9%	96.9%*
Agree			420	41.0%	
Disagree	7.2%	5.8%	25	2.4%	3.1%
Strongly Disagree			8	0.7%	

**\*Average affirmative response for questions related to Indicator 4A: Average of 92.4% and 96.9% = 94.6%**

Note 1: Previously, "parental rights" was "procedural safeguards". The wording change was made upon request of the SICCC to make the wording consistent with the document the families receive.

- B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs

Q24. Since being part of First Steps, I can work with professionals.

	Family Survey 2007	Family Survey 2008	Family Survey 2009		
Strongly Agree	96.5%	96.9%	506	55.4%	96.8%*
Agree			378	41.4%	
Disagree	3.5%	3.1%	27	2.9%	3.2%
Strongly Disagree			3	0.3%	

Q25. Since being part of First Steps, I know how to advocate for what my child needs.

	Family Survey 2007	Family Survey 2008	Family Survey 2009		
Strongly Agree	94.8%	94.9%	526	54.3%	94.4%*
Agree			389	40.1%	
Disagree	5.2%	5.1%	47	4.8%	5.6%
Strongly Disagree			8	0.8%	

**\*Average affirmative response for questions related to Indicator 4B: Average of 96.8% and 94.4% = 95.6%**

- C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn

Q19. First Steps services give my family the tools to directly improve my child's development.

	Family Survey 2007	Family Survey 2008	Family Survey 2009		
Strongly Agree	96.3%	96.6%	631	61.4%	97.4%*
Agree			369	36.0%	
Disagree	3.7%	3.4%	21	2.0%	2.6%
Strongly Disagree			6	0.6%	

**\*Affirmative response for question related to Indicator 4C: 97.4%**

**OSEDA Survey and Analysis:** As noted in the previous two (2) Annual Performance Reports, DESE worked with the University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA) to evaluate the representativeness and reliability of the First Steps Family Survey. As a result of this collaboration, changes to the 2007 survey included the addition of new items designed to meet the reporting requirements for this APR and to enhance subsequent analysis of survey data. In addition, a split survey methodology was used in 2007 to explore the use of sampling versus a census approach to gathering yearly data.

Several conclusions were drawn from analyzing the 2007 data from the split survey design:

- The two methods resulted in very similar rates of agreement
- No non-response bias was evident by using the census methodology
- Response rates by SPOE region did not differ between the two methodologies
- Survey results were representative of the state as a whole
- Either method (census or sample) is appropriate and produces valid and reliable data that adequately represent the population of the First Steps program.

For 2008-09, the census methodology was utilized and surveys were mailed to all families receiving First Steps services. An analysis of responses by SPOE indicates that response rates are comparable across the state.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Use results of parent surveys to target parent training opportunities
- Develop a consumer report from survey responses focusing on a small number of key questions
- Develop a parent newsletter with goal of quarterly distribution
- Develop parent training opportunities, including face-to-face trainings, handbooks, DVD
- Consider the development of a family mentor system within First Steps
- Use results of parent surveys to target service coordinator trainings

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Parent survey results:** Through a contract with Missouri's Parent Training Information Center, Missouri Parents Act (MPACT), Transition from C to B training was conducted for parents and agency personnel (consisting of First Steps, Head Start, LEA and MPACT staff) in spring 2009. Additional topics developed for 2009-10 parent trainings include communicating effectively, the First Steps process, and understanding parental rights. These topics were determined through analysis of the parent survey data and feedback from the local programs. Trainings will be a collaborative effort between representatives of the parent training and information center as well as lead agency staff. The intent of the training is to provide additional information to families on topical issues.

**Consumer report from parent survey responses:** As an additional part of the 2008-09 contract, MPACT analyzed family survey data focusing on a small number of key questions to develop topics for parent training opportunities [parent survey results above describe topics]. The data will be included in parent newsletters as a consumer report during 2009-10.

**Parent newsletter:** Quarterly parent newsletters were included in the 2008-09 contract with MPACT. Each year four editions of parent newsletters are published with topics determined from an analysis of the family survey data, a review of program data and related content selected by the local programs and lead agency. Topics in 2008-09 included dramatic play with young children, parental rights, family-guided routines and advocacy skills.

**Parent training opportunities:** During 2007-08, the lead agency prepared a packet on Part C to Part B transition to be provided to families as the Service Coordinator and family begin discussions about the transition from First Steps. This packet includes a video depicting the transition meeting and participation by early childhood programs at the local school district and community programs such as

Head Start. The packet also includes a parent handbook covering basic information on the transition process. The transition packets continue to be distributed to families. An additional Transition from C to B training was conducted by MPACT in the spring of 2009 to address steps to a successful transition.

**Family Mentor System:** This activity was not included in the current MPACT contract but may be considered in future years.

**Service Coordinator Trainings:** Service Coordinator trainings conducted by the lead agency in 2008-09 consisted of the following topics: 45-day timeline, parental rights, eligibility determination, and early intervention teams. SPOE Director trainings conducted by the lead agency in 2008-09 consisted of the following topics: due process/mediation/child complaint system, initial contacts, 45-day timeline, transition from C to B, and early intervention teams. In addition to the lead agency trainings, monthly staff meetings between SPOE Directors and Service Coordinators occur in most regions and consist of reminders and updates to policy and procedures.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions were made to the targets or improvement activities in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Indicator 5:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	0.79% of infants and toddlers birth to 1 will have IFSPs

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

At 0.75% of children birth to age 1 served by Missouri's First Steps program, the state did not meet the 2008-09 target.

**Percent of Children Birth to Age 1 with IFSPs**

	Dec-05	Dec-06	Dec-07	Dec-08
Child Count	547	500	617	616
Estimated Population*	77,970	78,424	80,673	82,359
Missouri %	0.71%	0.64%	0.76%	<b>0.75%</b>
National %			1.01%	1.04%

\* Estimated Population from US Bureau of Census

Source: Data from <http://spp-apr-calendar.rfcnetwork.org/explorer/view/id/793>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

While the number of children birth to age 1 remained stable, the state did not meet the target; however data as of October 2009 shows that the number of children birth to age 1 being served has increased by almost 10%.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Analyze data to target referral sources with high percentage of inappropriate referrals, promote referrals from underserved populations and educate primary referral sources (NICU, PAT, pediatricians, CAPTA, Newborn Hearing Screening)
- Analyze RICC Child Find plans to determine impact of actions on locating additional eligible children
- Work with Early Head Start/Head Start to increase identification of and inclusion of children with disabilities in those programs
- Continue to support PAT National Center training of parent educators on appropriate FS referrals and serving families and children with special needs
- Investigate the possible ways that RICC child find efforts could be assisted by the state



Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Referral Sources:** First Steps Area Directors and regional SPOE Directors participated in various state and local conferences related to early childhood intervention and education. Attendees receive information regarding the First Steps program, eligibility requirements and referral procedures.

Current data indicate the number of referrals has increased overall with the largest relative increases in Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) referrals. However, a continuing area of concern for the state is that approximately half of all referrals do not result in an IFSP, due to ineligibility, parent withdrawal prior to IFSP development or the inability to contact the family after the initial referral is made. Missouri's narrow criteria may be part of the reason for this high percentage of ineligible children. There continues to be a need to educate primary referral sources about the program's criteria.

Over the past year, increases were seen in the eligibility rates for some of the less prevalent referral sources, such as CAPTA, Department of Health and Senior Services, other health care provider, public health facilities and social service agencies. Eligibility rates from referrals made by parents showed a slight increase, but the eligibility rate for referrals from Parents as Teachers (PAT) showed a slight decrease. However, since the data collection process does not capture where the parent obtained First Steps referral information (i.e., secondary referral source) and PAT educators encourage the parent to make the referral themselves, this could indicate that the eligibility rates among parent and PAT referrals remained relatively unchanged. Ongoing collaboration with this referral source continues to be very important.

**RICC Child Find:** For the 2008-09 reporting period, each Regional Interagency Coordinating Council (RICC) reported collaboration with Head Start offices, Parents as Teachers (PAT), local community hospitals and physician's offices, the Department of Mental Health and local early childhood programs. Specific activities included the improvement and distribution of printed materials, developing community resource lists and attending early childhood and health fairs.

**Early Head Start/Head Start:** In January 2009, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, in partnership with the Missouri Head Start Collaboration Office and the Missouri Department of Social Services completed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The purpose of this MOU is to support local efforts in providing collaborative high quality services to families of children with disabilities birth to five years in the areas of identification, evaluation, IFSP/IEP development, training, and transition. Lead agency staff also participates in the Missouri Head Start advisory council and Missouri's SpecialQuest Birth-5 Initiative.

**PAT National Center Training:** Parents as Teachers (PAT) is a program offered in every school district in Missouri with voluntary participation of families of children between the ages of birth and five (5) years. First Steps Area Directors and SPOE Directors assist the PAT National Center, located in St. Louis, Missouri, with facilitating a First Steps presentation at their annual special needs training for PAT educators as well as ongoing in-services for professional development. At these presentations, they share information regarding the First Steps program, including IDEA, eligibility criteria, facilitating appropriate referrals and referral procedures.

**RICC Child Find Assistance:** Missouri law at 160.932 RSMo (Revised Statutes of Missouri) established a Child Find Coordinator pilot program in one region of the state, which started July 1, 2008 and is expected to be in place for three years. The RICC in this region is in charge of the position and assists the Child Find Coordinator with activities and materials. An annual report was provided in June 2009 for activities conducted in fiscal year 2008-09 and concluded the region experienced an increase in the average number of monthly referrals with the largest growth in NICU referrals. At the end of the three year pilot project, any successful activities identified through the pilot will be considered for replication statewide.

#### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions to targets or improvement activities have been made in the State Performance Plan.

#### **MO FFY (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Indicator 6:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	1.61% of infants and toddlers birth to 3 will have IFSPs

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

At 1.55% of children birth to age 3 served by Missouri's First Steps program, the state did not meet the 2008-09 target but did see an increase over the previous year.

**Percent of Children Birth to Age 3 with IFSPs**

	Dec-05	Dec-06	Dec-07	Dec-08
Child Count	3,376	3,216	3,450	3,784
Estimated Population*	228,675	234,751	238,086	243,847
Missouri %	1.48%	1.37%	1.45%	<b>1.55%</b>
National %			2.48%	2.66%

\* Estimated Population from US Bureau of Census

Source: Data from <http://spp-apr-calendar.rfcnetwork.org/explorer/view/id/793>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

While Missouri did not meet the target for this indicator, a significant increase was seen in the last year, both in the number and percentage of children served. As reported in the APR for 2006-07, the state contracted with a firm to review the state's eligibility criteria and develop a model to predict the percentage of eligible children that may require Part C services. The conclusions drawn from the study indicated that the current eligibility criteria in Missouri would place the child find goals within a range of 1.65 to 1.85 percent of the population ages birth to three. Overall, Missouri is still below the 1.65% threshold, however significant gain is evident in several SPOE regions, and the child count as of October 2009 is more than 400 children higher than the December 1, 2008 count.

See the discussion for Indicator 5 for information about both the birth to 1 and birth to 3 groups.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions to targets or improvement activities have been made in the State Performance Plan.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Indicator 7:** Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100.0% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs will have an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-day timelines

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

While not meeting the target of 100%, the state, at 95.0% shows a very high percent of compliance with the 45-day timeline requirement.

**45-Day Timeline Data (includes initial IFSPs developed throughout the entire fiscal year)**

Initial IFSPs	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08**	2008-09**
# IFSPs with acceptable timelines*	2,332	2,388	1,478	1,336
Total IFSPs	2,566	2,510	1,551	1,406
% with acceptable timelines	90.9%	95.1%	95.3%	<b>95.0%</b>

\* "Acceptable timelines" includes those evaluations and initial IFSP meetings completed within the 45-day timeline as well as those that went over 45 days due to parent or child reasons. Both the IFSPs with acceptable timelines (numerator) and the total IFSPs (denominator) include children whose delays were due to exceptional family circumstances. See explanation below for more information.

\*\*Data reported above are for five of the ten SPOEs in the state.

The following table provides detail on the reasons for exceeding the 45-day timeline. These reasons are required to be entered by Service Coordinators in the web system if a referral exceeds 45 days.

Reasons for Exceeding Initial IFSP Timelines (July 1, 2008-to June 30, 2009)	'Acceptable' Reasons	'Unacceptable' Reasons or No Reason Provided			Grand Total
		Parent/Child Delay	SPOE Delay	Provider Delay	
Total	170	10	3	1	184
% of Total	92.4%	5.4%	1.6%	0.6%	100.0%

Data showed that 99% (1,392 of 1,406) of Initial IFSPs occurred either within the 45-day timeline or had a Parent/Child delay for exceeding the timeline. Given the high percentage of reasons coded as Parent/Child Delay, DESE Compliance staff reviewed case notes for a sample of children with Parent/Child Delay reasons to determine if those reasons were valid, meaning that the timeline delay was caused by hospitalizations, family vacations, or documented non-response from families. The review revealed that approximately 29% of the Parent/Child Delay reasons were not valid since SPOEs/providers were clearly responsible for the delay, or case notes did not sufficiently support why the parent/child contributed to the delay. For each of the SPOEs, the percent of invalid Parent/Child Delay reasons was applied to the total number of Parent/Child reasons, and the total acceptable number was reduced. This resulted in moving 56 children out of the acceptable reasons category and into the unacceptable reasons category. Therefore, DESE adjusted the timeline numbers to account for this as shown below.

45-Day Timeline Calculation Details	Prior to adjustment	Adjusted
Initial IFSPs	1,406	1,406
Initial IFSPs under 45 days	1,222	1,222
Initial IFSPs over 45 days with acceptable reasons	170	114
Initial IFSPs over 45 days with unacceptable reasons	14	70
Total under 45 days or with acceptable reasons	1,392	1,336
Percent under 45 days or with acceptable reasons	99.0%	95.0%

For children whose 45-day timelines were not met, the delays ranged from 1 to 151 days, with half having less than 10 days of delay. Another 33% of delays were between 10 and 30 days. Delays were due to the inability to contact the family or child illness/hospitalization. The longest delay of 151 days was due to the inability to contact the family via phone or mail.

#### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

While the state did not meet the target of 100% for 2008-09, Missouri continues to demonstrate 95% compliance with this indicator.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Identify barriers within each SPOE region to meeting 45-day timelines and target technical assistance toward those barriers
- Implement consistent screening, evaluation and assessment procedures across the state in order to meet 45-day timelines

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Identify barriers and target technical assistance:** The lead agency conducts quarterly meetings with all ten SPOE Directors, lead Service Coordinators, as designated by the SPOE, and Area Directors in attendance. During these meetings the SPOE staff share challenges related to SPOE operations and ask questions regarding DESE policies and procedures. In 2008-09 targeted technical

assistance was provided to the SPOEs related to initial contact with families, discussion of development, eligibility determination, and provider availability.

**Implement consistent procedures:** In 2007-08, SPOEs reported inconsistencies in how standardized evaluation tools were utilized, how service providers reported results and how eligibility was determined for First Steps. In addition, DESE staff identified a need to distinguish between screening, evaluation and assessment procedures to achieve statewide consistency. As a result, the Developmental Assessment of Young Children (DAYC) was identified as a uniform instrument to determine eligibility. The First Steps Area Directors conducted DAYC trainings in 2008-09 for more than 300 service providers.

In order to improve consistent practices between the ten (10) SPOE regions, the lead agency updated the Service Coordinator Practice Manual and posted it on the First Steps website. The lead agency also conducted a week-long training regarding the 45-day timeline and procedures related to referral, eligibility determination and IFSP. Representation from each of the ten SPOE regions was in attendance at the training and follow-up was provided, as needed, by the Area Directors.

**Correction of Previous Noncompliance:** There were no findings of pervasive noncompliance issued in 2007-08, either for the 2006-07 or 2007-08 reviews of 45-day timelines.

The Department reviewed 2006-07 45-day timeline data in December 2007 for all ten (10) SPOEs and twelve (12) Department of Mental Health (DMH) Regional Centers. Final reports for the 2006-07 timeline reviews were not issued until mid-February 2008. Because agencies had not yet had 12 months to correct identified noncompliance before last year's APR was submitted to OSEP, DESE could not report on the correction of 2006-07 noncompliance at that time.

In the summer of 2008, DESE decided to discontinue monitoring timelines annually for each SPOE. Beginning with 2008-09 monitoring, each set of five (5) SPOEs will include an onsite and timeline review using data from the previous year. Therefore, the 2007-08 timeline data were reviewed for the SPOEs receiving an onsite monitoring in 2008-09.

Verification of 2007-08 individual child data indicated those who did not receive their IFSPs within 45 days did receive an IFSP within one to 52 days after the 45-day timeline. Therefore, all individual noncompliance was corrected within twelve months.

Missouri requires 100% correction of noncompliance identified in all initial monitoring reviews, as well as in any follow-up files submitted for review. Any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct any noncompliance within 12 months of the initial review (timely correction) would not be considered to be in compliance and would be subject to the enforcement actions discussed in the SPP.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions to targets or improvement activities have been made in the State Performance Plan.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table**

**OSEP Analysis/Next Steps**

The state must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the state under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**DESE Response:**

The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The state was able to verify that all noncompliance **was** corrected within one year of notification.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Indicator 8:** Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100% of all children exiting Part C will receive timely transition planning by their third birthday

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

The percent of compliance is 100% for 8A.

	Number of children	Number in compliance	Number out of compliance	Percent in compliance 2008-09
A: IFSPs with transition steps and services	75	75	0	100.0%

**Trend data:**

Year	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Percent in compliance (8A)	92.7%	100.0%	100.0%

The results for 8A were gathered from reviews of approximately 15 randomly selected files of children who exited the program during 2008-09 from each of five SPOEs monitored during this cycle.

**The percent of compliance is 98.6% for 8B.**

	Number of children in Sample	Number of parents who refused consent	Number of parents providing consent	Number of LEAs notified	Percent in compliance 2008-09
B: Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B	75	1	74	74	<b>98.6%</b>

**Trend data:**

Year	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Percent in compliance (8B)	90.9%	94.7%	98.6%

The results for 8B were gathered from file reviews of the same children referred to in 8A, who exited the program during 2008-09, and reflects the number of children with parental consent to notify the LEA. The single instance of noncompliance was a parent who initially refused to allow any information to be given to the LEA, but changed her mind at the transition meeting stating that “general information” could be provided. Subsequently, the Service Coordinator provided the LEA with the child’s name and date of birth, but failed to provide the parent’s name, address, and telephone number. Ultimately, the parent chose not to refer the child to ECSE.

Current state regulations require parental consent prior to notifying the LEA of Part C children who may be eligible for Part B services. These regulations provide for verbal or written consent to invite the LEA to the transition meeting. When consent is obtained, the LEA is invited to the Transition Meeting and is provided with the child’s name, date of birth, and parent information (to include name, address and telephone number). Before, during or after the Transition Meeting the current IFSP (including the transition plan, evaluations, and written reports within the last year from service providers) is given to the LEA, if a release of information (ROI) has been signed by the parent.

On March 31, 2009, OSEP notified Missouri that its state policy requiring a signed release of information (ROI) from the parent prior to notifying the LEA with the name, date of birth, and parent contact information of potentially eligible children did not meet federal requirements and a revision to the state’s policy would be required. As a result, Missouri provided OSEP with a proposed “opt out” policy and forms which were approved June 4, 2009, assuring that a change in state regulation would be accomplished by June 30, 2010, bringing Missouri into full compliance with that requirement. All System Points of Entry (SPOEs) were trained regarding the new “opt out” policy June 15-18, 2009, and SPOES were directed to begin implementation July 1, 2009.

While not meeting the target of 100% for 8B, the state has significantly improved the percentage in notification to the LEA of children potentially eligible for Part B. As the chart above indicates, the LEA was not notified of the parent’s name, address and telephone number for only one (1) of 75 children (1.4%). It should be noted, however, the child’s name and birth date were provided for that child.

The percent of compliance is 92.6% for 8C.

	Number of children	Number in compliance	Number out of compliance	Percent in compliance 2008-09
C: Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B	715	662	53	<b>92.6%</b>

**Trend data:**

Year	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Percent in compliance (8C)	78.1%	94.2%	92.6%

While not meeting the target of 100% for 8C, the state has maintained a high percentage of compliance (90% or better) with transition planning requirements.

Results for 8C were gathered from a data review of children transitioning from Part C to Part B from July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009 from the same five SPOEs as reviewed for 8A and 8B. Reasons were gathered for approximately 44% of the delayed transition conferences. Results showed that 50% of the delays were due to acceptable child/family reasons such as child or family illness, family vacation, etc. The total number of children with delayed transition conferences was then adjusted to account for these acceptable reasons. These exceptional family circumstances have been included in the numerator and denominator of the calculation for indicator 8C.

Current state regulations require that transition meetings must occur “six months prior” to the child’s third birthday. During stakeholder discussions of this indicator, parents, providers and other early intervention professionals suggested that Missouri’s current requirement for a transition meeting by 2 years 6 months may not be appropriate. Parents reported that they were not always ready to make decisions about transition plans until just before their child turned 3 years old. While they do discuss their options for services after their child’s third birthday on an ongoing basis, many parents indicated that they were not ready to hold a transition meeting with the school district at 2 1/2 years; therefore, the state anticipates proposing changes to the current state regulations by June 30, 2010, to include holding the transition meeting by 2 years 8 months (or 120 days) prior to the third birthday. Using this proposed standard, the state would have a compliance rating of 97.7%.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

The state met the 100% target for 8A. Indicator 8B did not meet the 100% target, but showed improvement from the previous year (from 94.7% to 98.6% compliance). Indicator 8C did not meet the 100% target and slipped from 94.2% in 2007-08 to 92.6% in 2008-09. It is believed that this slippage is largely due to the transfer of multiple caseloads to all SPOE agencies creating a need to hire and train additional staff during the summer of 2008.

It is anticipated that improvement will be evident in the next APR submitted.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Update, implement and evaluate the Part C to Part B transition training for Part C and 619 personnel for technical assistance and corrective action purposes
- Provide targeted technical assistance to SPOEs and Service Coordinators in order to have 100% of SPOEs meeting compliance requirements for Part C to B
- Develop and distribute transition DVD as part of an information packet for families preparing to exit Part C and move to Part B early childhood services



Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Part C to B Transition Training Module:** In 2008-09 the lead agency developed a “transition page” on the First Steps website to organize all training and technical assistance materials in one place. This page can be viewed at: <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/FirstSteps/Transitionindexpg.htm>. Additionally, statewide transition training is conducted every other year. This was initiated in spring 2006. Individual SPOE regions and local school district early childhood special education staff were included in the 2006 and 2008 trainings. With technical assistance documents available online as well as an online training module, it was determined that biennial face-to-face trainings would be sufficient to ensure compliance with this indicator.

**Targeted Technical Assistance:** In 2008-09 Transition C-B training materials, including PowerPoint presentation, timeline chart, and Q&A documents were posted on the web and updated as needed to clarify procedures. Additionally ongoing technical assistance has been available through the Area Directors to SPOE Directors and Service Coordinators as needed.

**Transition DVD:** During 2007-08, the lead agency prepared a family information packet on Part C to Part B transition. This packet includes a DVD depicting the transition meeting and participation by early childhood programs at the local school district and community programs such as Head Start. The packet also includes a parent handbook covering basic information on the transition process. Packets were distributed to all school district early childhood special education (ECSE) programs in the fall of 2008, with follow-up clarification to districts in January 2009. These packets continue to be provided to families as the Service Coordinator and family begin discussions about the transition from First Steps.

**Correction of previous noncompliance:** In 2007-08, no findings of pervasive noncompliance were issued for 8A or 8B. Eleven (11) findings of pervasive noncompliance were issued for 8C and all were corrected and verified within 12 months of the date of notification.

The Department reviewed 2006-07 transition timeline data in December 2007 for all ten (10) SPOEs and twelve (12) Department of Mental Health (DMH) Regional Centers. Final reports for the 2006-07 timeline reviews were not issued until mid-February 2008. Because agencies had not yet had 12 months to correct identified noncompliance before last year's APR was submitted to OSEP, DESE could not report on the correction of 2006-07 noncompliance at that time.

In the summer of 2008, DESE decided to discontinue monitoring timelines annually for each SPOE. Beginning with 2008-09 monitoring, each set of 5 SPOEs will include an onsite and timeline review using data from the previous year. Therefore, 2007-08 timeline data were reviewed for the SPOEs receiving an onsite monitoring in 2008-09.

For any child still in the First Steps program at the time of verification of correction of individual noncompliance for 8A, 8B and 8C, all individual noncompliance was corrected within 12 months.

Missouri requires 100% correction of noncompliance identified in all initial monitoring reviews, as well as in any follow-up files submitted for review. Any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct any noncompliance within 12 months of the initial review (timely correction) would not be considered to be in compliance and would be subject to the enforcement actions discussed in the SPP.

#### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions to targets have been made in the State Performance Plan. Improvement activities were revised from the 2009 SPP as a result of an evaluation process.

#### **MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table**

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps:

The state must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the state under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement; and (2) has provided notification to the LEA, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

The state must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the state under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has conducted a transition conference for each child potentially eligible for Part B, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**DESE Response:**

The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The state was able to verify that all noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.

The state will submit its revised transition documents with its Part C Application due May 10, 2010.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Indicator 9:** General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100% of noncompliance will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:** Missouri had 100% timely correction of noncompliance identified in 2007-08. Missouri requires 100% correction of identified noncompliance in all initial monitoring reviews, as well as in any follow-up files submitted for review. In conducting follow-up verification reviews for correction of identified pervasive noncompliance, the new files submitted for review must show 100% correction. If they do not, additional slices of data (additional file samples) are required until the agency is cleared of noncompliance at 100%. All correctable noncompliance identified for individual children during follow-up review(s) is required to be corrected at 100%. Any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct any identified noncompliance within 12 months of the initial review (timely correction) would not be considered to be in compliance and would be subject to the enforcement actions discussed in the SPP.

This APR shows the correction of identified noncompliance for two years: 2006-07 timelines reviewed for all ten (10) SPOEs and twelve (12) Department of Mental Health (DMH) Regional Centers; and 2007-08 onsite monitoring of five (5) SPOEs and six (6) DMH Regional Centers.

The Missouri First Steps Program was restructured in 2005-06 when twenty-four (24) SPOE regions were consolidated to ten (10). The newly formed SPOEs began operation in February 2006. No initial onsite monitoring was conducted during 2006-07 because the new SPOEs were required to correct all previously identified noncompliance from the SPOE regions they inherited as a result of the restructure.

The Department did, however, review 2006-07 timeline data (Part C SPP Indicators 1, 7, and 8C) in December 2007 for all ten (10) SPOEs and twelve (12) DMH Regional Centers. At that time DESE planned to conduct timeline reviews for all SPOEs and DMH Regional Centers annually. In addition to the 2006-07 timeline review, results for 8A and 8B were gathered by reviewing fifteen (15) randomly selected files of children who exited the program during 2006-07 from each of five (5) SPOEs and six (6) DMH Regional Centers that would not be receiving an onsite visit in 2007-08. Final reports for the 2006-07 review were not issued until mid-February 2008. Because reports to the agencies went out after February 1, 2008, and the agencies had not yet had twelve (12) months to correct identified

noncompliance before the January 30, 2009 APR was submitted to OSEP, DESE could not report on the correction of 2006-07 noncompliance in last year's APR.

SPOEs are monitored for SPP compliance indicators as well as additional state standards and indicators. The correction of noncompliance from findings issued in 2007-08 is reported in the following table. The columns of the table are as follows:

- (a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in 2007-08 – the total number of monitoring indicators found out of compliance
- (b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification – the total number of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year from the date of the reports

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	NA
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring Activities:	2	3	3
	Dispute Resolution:	1	1	1
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities:	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs				
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Monitoring Activities:	1	6	6
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:  B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:  C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	Monitoring Activities:	11	11	11
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0
<b>Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b</b>			22	22
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			(b) / (a) X 100 =	<b>100.0%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

The state met the target of 100% for this indicator.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Revise sanctions in state regulations and provider contracts
- Provide targeted technical assistance by Area Directors to SPOEs/providers based on data reviews and other information
- Implement web-based system for monitoring and self-assessment purposes
- Fully implement IFSP Quality Indicators Rating Scale (QIRS) to assess IFSP quality

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Revise sanctions:** Current state regulations include a provision that DESE may initiate actions through the contractual provisions between DESE and First Steps contractors. SPOE contracts include provisions for liquidated damages based on specified criteria. Since these provisions are in place, this improvement activity is no longer needed and is being removed from the SPP.

**Targeted technical assistance:** The lead agency employs First Steps Area Directors to assist SPOEs and Early Intervention (EI) providers with specific issues identified through data and compliance monitoring reviews. Throughout 2008-09, Area Directors reviewed data reports regularly and provided technical assistance as needed, to help ensure that SPOE staff and providers were informed about and operating under compliant procedures.

**Implement web-based monitoring system:** IMACS - Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System for Part C was completed in summer 2008. It includes the SPOE Program Planning, Quality Indicators Rating Scale (QIRS) reviews/data, compliance file reviews and corrective action plans.

**IFSP Quality Indicators Rating Scale:** The IFSP QIRS process was developed by lead agency staff, in conjunction with nationally recognized early childhood experts, to provide a “quality” evaluation instrument used to evaluate IFSPs. Throughout 2008-09, the First Steps Area Directors provided training and technical assistance to each SPOE region regarding the QIRS process and expectations.

The SPOE contracts require that the region receive an overall score on the QIRS review in the “acceptable” to “high quality” range or liquidated damages will be applied to the next year’s contract. For the 2008-09, each of the SPOE regions reviewed received ratings at the acceptable level; therefore, no penalty was applied to the contract renewal for the 2008-09 fiscal year based on the QIRS review.

The Area Directors will review the QIRS results with each SPOE office and hold training activities targeted to continue strengthening the quality of IFSP development. These efforts are intended to ensure that all children and families receive high quality intervention services through the First Steps program.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions to targets have been made in the State Performance Plan. One improvement activity regarding sanctions has been removed as indicated above.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table**

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps:

The state must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the state’s monitoring system, through the state’s data system and by the department); and (2) verified that each EIS program with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-09.

In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8B, and 8C in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the state must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.

In reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2008 APR, the state must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet

**DESE Response**

The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance. The state was able to verify that all noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.

The state used the Indicator 9 Worksheet.



## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Indicator 10:** Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:** Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

During 2008-09, three child complaints were filed, all of which were withdrawn by the parent. Therefore, there were no reports issued for 2008-09.

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Complaints with reports issued	19	3	6	0
Reports within timelines	14	3	6	0
Reports within extended timelines	5	0	0	0
Percent issued within 60 day or extended timelines	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	NA

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Maintain current procedures to ensure continued compliance

DESE continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for issuance of child complaints. Reports are monitored to ensure that reports are issued within 60 days or, if not possible due to the nature of the complaint, appropriate extensions are made when necessary.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions to targets or improvement activities have been made in the State Performance Plan.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Indicator 11:** Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:** Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

During 2008-09, four due process hearing requests were received and all were resolved without a hearing.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Maintain current procedures to ensure continued compliance

DESE continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for due process hearing requests. Missouri uses a 30-day timeline which does not provide for extensions.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions to targets or improvement activities have been made in the State Performance Plan.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Indicator 12:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:** Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	Missouri did not adopt Part B due process procedures for Part C.

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

Not applicable as Missouri did not adopt Part B due process procedures for Part C.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Not applicable

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

Not applicable

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Indicator 13:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:** Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	Not set due to lack of baseline data

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

There were no mediation requests during 2008-09.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Not applicable

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions to targets or improvement activities have been made in the State Performance Plan.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2008-09

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Indicator 14:** State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:** State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count and settings and November 1 for exiting and dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	100% of State reported data will be timely and accurate

**Actual Target Data for 2008-09:**

The state met the 100% target for this indicator.

Missouri utilizes a variety of data sources to compile data for the Annual Performance Report and the Section 618 data. Sources include the following:

- WebSPOE system - WebSPOE is a web-based system used to maintain child level data for the First Steps program. Child level information includes referral, evaluation, meeting, and IFSP data. These data are used for the Section 618 child count, primary setting and exit reporting. WebSPOE is also used for APR Indicators 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8
- Monitoring – data gathered through monitoring reviews are utilized for Indicators 8 and 9
- Dispute Resolution Database – the database is used to record information on child complaints, due process hearing requests, mediations and resolution sessions. The database is used to monitor timelines throughout the year, and data are used for the Section 618 Dispute Resolution table and for APR Indicators 10-13
- Others – See Indicators 3 (SPP) and 4 (APR) for information about Early Childhood Outcomes and the First Steps Family Survey <http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>

Missouri utilized OSEP's scoring rubric to evaluate the accuracy and timeliness of data collected for 2008-09. The results follow:

Indicator 14 - SPP/APR Data			
APR Indicator	Valid and reliable	Correct calculation	Total
1	1	1	2
2	1	1	2
3	1	1	2
4	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
6	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8A	1	1	2
8B	1	1	2
8C	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
		<b>Subtotal</b>	30
<b>APR Score Calculation</b>	<b>Timely Submission Points</b> (5 pts for submission of APR/SPP by February 1, 2010)		5
	<b>Grand Total</b>		35

Indicator 14 - 618 Data					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Date Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/1/09	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 – Settings Due Date: 2/1/09	1	1	1	1	4
Table 3 – Exiting Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	NA	3
Table 4 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	N/A	3
				<b>Subtotal</b>	14
			<b>Weighted Total</b> (subtotal X 2.5)		35
<b>Indicator # 14 Calculation</b>					
			A. APR Total	35	35
			B. 618 Total	35	35
			C. Grand Total	70	70
Percent of timely and accurate data = (C divided by 70 times 100)			(C) / (70) X 100 =		100.0%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008-09:**

Missouri met the target of 100% for timely and accurate state reported data. All 618 data and required reports have been submitted on or before the due dates. OSEP data reports, as well as data submitted in the SPP/APR are accurate as evidenced by the verification efforts described below.

Improvement activities for 2008-09 included the following:

- Continue data review process to target technical assistance and improve accountability for data entered in the child data system
- Continue to review and improve data verification process

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Data review process:** Data reviews were conducted in 2008-09 for indicators as previously discussed throughout this document. Through these reviews issues were identified at an early stage in order to address and correct them proactively. Data are used to target areas that SPOEs must address through program planning activities.

**Data verification process:** Missouri implemented the web-based child data system in the summer of 2005. This system captures data elements in the Part C system and contains information from referral, eligibility determination and IFSP development. The system is compliance-driven; it requires critical data items and conducts edit checks on data to help ensure accuracy. The system supplies data that can be reviewed at the SPOE and state levels for program evaluation and monitoring purposes. Much of the data for the SPP/APR comes from this system, and various data elements are verified as necessary.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008-09:**

No revisions to targets or improvement activities have been made in the State Performance Plan.

**MO FFY 2007 (2007-08) Response Table:**

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps

In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2008 APR, the state must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.

DESE Response:

The state used the Indicator 14 Data Rubric to provide the data for this indicator. The rubric is replicated in this document.